REMARKS

In the Office Action,[1] the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,182,094 to Humpleman et al.

("*Humpleman*") in view of U.S. Patent 5,526,130 to Kim ("*Kim*").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Humpleman* in view of *Kim*. A *prima facie* case of

obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims because, among

other things, neither *Humpleman* nor *Kim*, taken alone or in any reasonable

combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of claims 1-15.

Claim 1, for example, recites an information processing device adapted to be

connected to other information processing devices by way of a network comprising,

among other things:

> an acquisition means for acquiring a second piece of
> information on the schedule of operation of the function
> execution means not contained in the previously stored first
> piece of information, wherein the second piece of information
> includes information associated with recording reservation of
> the devices in the network;
>
> a control means for putting the second piece of
> information into a predetermined block format and storing it
> in the storage means as additional information to the first
> piece of information; and
>
> display means for displaying a warning indicating
> double booking of recording reservations to a user and
> displaying the cause of the double booking, according to the
> first and second pieces of information

---

1 The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that *Humpleman* "fails to particularly disclose an acquisition means for acquiring a second piece of information on the schedule of operation not contained in the first information and wherein the control means putting the second information into a predetermined block format (stored to digital memory) and storing it in storage as additional information to the first information" (Non-final Office action at p. 3).

Kim also fails to teach or suggest an acquisition means as recited in claim 1. According to *Kim*, "a test is performed to determine whether the broadcast schedule has been input during step 430" and "if the broadcast schedule has not been input, the test is repeated to check the input" (*Kim* at col. 8, lines 47-50). If the broadcast schedule has been input in the device of *Kim*, "a check is performed as to whether the key data the user has input and the broadcast schedule recognition data to be compared are detected" (col. 8, lines 53-55).

As stated by the Examiner, at p. 3 of the Final Office action, *Kim* performs a comparison, and "when the data are identical", *Kim* further discloses, "the whole program title, starting and finishing time of the program, channel, date, character header code, update-purpose starting time, finishing time, date, update-purpose character header code and the like, is stored in the memory during step 470." Accordingly, *Kim* merely discloses comparison and detection means, while claim 1 recites "acquisition means for acquiring a second piece of information on the schedule of operation of the function execution means not contained in the previously stored first piece of information, wherein the second piece of information includes information associated

-9-

with recording reservation of the devices in the network." *Kim* does not disclose information associated with recording reservation of devices in a network.

Kim, at col. 8, lines 47-67, also fails to teach or suggest "control means for putting the second piece of information into a predetermined block format and storing it in the storage means as additional information to the first piece of information."

According to *Kim*, "each recognized data" (col. 8, lines 65-66) "is stored in the memory during step 470 to thereby finish the reserved video recording establishment process during step 480" (col. 9, lines 3-5). Claim 1 recites a "second piece of information" being "acquired" and "control means" for putting this "second piece of information into a predetermined block format," while *Kim* merely teaches recognizing data and storing it in memory. Thus, *Kim* fails to teach a piece of information acquired and put in a predetermined block format, as required by claim 1.

Kim also fails to disclose "displaying means for displaying a warning indicating double booking of recording reservations to a user and displaying the cause of the double booking, according to the first and second pieces of information." *Kim* discloses a character input reserved video recording in response to direct input of a program title (col. 2, lines 35-38). *Kim* does not disclose information associated with recording reservation of devices in a network and therefore does not disclose displaying a warning indicating double booking of recording reservations to a user, as recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 8 and 15, although of different scope, recite similar elements to claim 1. Because neither *Humpleman* nor *Kim*, taken alone or in any reasonable combination, teaches or suggests each and every element recited by independent claims 1, 8, and 15, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established.

-10-

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Humpleman* in view of *Kim*.

Claims 2-7 and 9-14 depend from one of the independent claims and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1 and 8. In addition, each of the dependent claims may recite unique combinations that are neither taught nor suggested by prior art.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-15 in condition for allowance.

Finally, applicants submit that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 8, 2006   By: _____

Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921